

Petition re: Environmental Management Permit Request LEM 03-044 (after the fact) (to be amended). Ravine Erosion Stabilization at 1571 Clifford Hill Road. Parcel ID #11-22-51-D-168-2

1. Premises purchased October 31, 1989. Increasingly severe erosion over 12-year period due to storm-water runoff widened and deepened original drainage ditch (ravine), took much of our front yard, finally reached to within a foot of our access driveway, and threatened septic tank and drainfield..
2. August 2001: Installed large heavy-timber retaining wall (approximately 10 ft. high x 40 ft. long) along original bank of ravine. Backfilled and landscaped to restore original property..
3. Severe scouring developed at base of wall, threatening its stability. February 2003: Cumbie Concrete poured concrete along base of wall and ravine bottom. Water velocity and volume not significantly changed. Neighbor complained to Environmental Management (George Su, Senior Engineer), which advised that a permit was required for the concrete.
4. Allen Nobles and Associates (Bill Adams, vice president) prepared permit application, submitted on May 7, 2003, by us, with the \$324 application fee. (See attached permit request.) We heard nothing from the County Engineer and assumed that the permit had been granted.
5. August 15, 2003: Talked to George Su about pouring another 5 yards of concrete to protect lower end of wall where scouring had developed. He advised that the permit application was deficient and referred us to our engineer, Bill Adams. We then discovered that Mr. Su had written Mr. Adams (no copy to us) requesting a considerable amount of additional information, the cost of which would approximate \$7,500. (See attached letter.) Failing to notify us, the applicant, is clearly contrary to county regulations. He advised us to amend the application for the additional concrete we wanted to pour, including the engineering studies and reports detailed in the attached letter.
6. We have pleaded with the county on several occasions for help with our water problem and were told that nothing could be done because ours is "private property." Bob Rackleff and Ed DePuy have personally come out within the last year to look at the situation. Our chief goal is to stabilize and protect the retaining wall. We are willing to install dissipaters and rip-rap at the end of the run of concrete. It is perfectly obvious to anyone who looks that nothing we want to do will change the velocity or volume of water that runs through this ravine. If anything, the converse is true. As far as water flow is concerned, there will be no change in downstream conditions that would not have occurred had we done nothing at all. The County Engineer is effectively treating this ravine, which runs for a short distance on our property to Highway 90, as an easement; yet the county has repeatedly refused to take any responsibility in this matter, including the ditching of Maggie Lane (another "private road") that causes us a massive amount of storm-water runoff.
7. The worsening storm-water problem we face has been exacerbated by developments permitted by the county and the city, and by its refusal to deal with drainage problems in this area. We are in effect stuck between a rock and a hard place. On the one hand, the county will not help because we are "private property." On the other, we are forbidden to make minimal changes to save our property except at a cost that is utterly prohibitive to us.

We ask the county either to take responsibility for protecting our retaining wall and property or, by granting our amended permit application, to allow us to do so by pouring a small additional amount of concrete without the necessity of absurdly expensive engineering studies.

Marcia Hengehold Southerland
Harold P. Southerland